

On the turbulent energy cascade in anisotropic Magneto-hydrodynamic turbulence

V. CARBONE^{1,2} ET AL.

¹ *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università della Calabria, Rende (CS), Italy*

² *Liquid Crystal Laboratory (CNR), Rende (CS), Italy*

PACS. 52.30.Cv – Magnetohydrodynamics (including electron magnetohydrodynamics).

PACS. 94.05.Lk – Turbulence.

PACS. 96.50.Tf – MHD waves, plasma waves, turbulence in interplanetary physics.

Abstract. –

The problem of the occurrence of an energy cascade for Alfvénic turbulence in solar wind plasmas was historically addressed by using phenomenological arguments based to the weakness of nonlinear interactions and the anisotropy of the cascade in wave vectors space. Here, this paradox is reviewed through the formal derivation of a Yaglom relation from anisotropic Magneto-hydrodynamic equation. The Yaglom relation involves a third-order moment calculated from velocity and magnetic fields and involving both Elsässer vector fields, and is particularly useful to be used as far as spacecraft observations of turbulence are concerned.

Introduction. – In a seminal paper, Dobrowolny, Mangeney and Veltri [1] (hereafter DMV), raised the question of the existence of an energy cascade in Magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) turbulence because the apparent contradiction of two competing observations within the solar wind turbulence by *in situ* satellite measurements. In fact, since the oldest space flights, both a well defined turbulent spectrum, and strong correlations between velocity and magnetic field fluctuations have been observed [2, 3] (for a modern review of turbulence in the solar wind cfr. Ref. [4]). The apparent contradiction between these observations can be immediately seen by introducing the Elsässer variables

$$Z^{\pm}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{v} \pm \frac{\mathbf{B}}{\sqrt{4\pi\rho}}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_i$ and $\mathbf{B}_i$ represent the velocity and magnetic field respectively, while ρ is the mass density. These quantities represent Alfvénic fluctuations propagating along the background magnetic field, in opposite directions. MHD equations can be immediately written in terms of these variables as

$$\partial_t Z_i^{\pm} + (Z_{\alpha}^{\mp} \partial_{\alpha}) Z_i^{\pm} = -\partial_i \pi + \lambda^{\pm} \partial_{\alpha}^2 Z_i^{\pm} + \lambda^{\mp} \partial_{\alpha}^2 Z_i^{\mp} \quad (1)$$

where $\pi = P/\rho$ (P being the the total pressure), ∂_t represents time derivative while ∂_i represents derivative with respect to the spatial variable x_i . The kinematic viscosity ν and the

magnetic diffusivity μ form the dissipative coefficients $\lambda^\pm = (\nu \pm \mu)/2$. The second term in equations (1) shows that nonlinear interactions only occur between opposite sign fluctuations. Since high correlations between velocity and magnetic fluctuations imply either $Z_i^\mp = 0$ or $Z_i^\pm = 0$, a turbulent energy cascade should be incompatible with the disappearance of one of the alfvénic fluctuations. The puzzle have been apparently solved by DMV [1]. In presence of a strong magnetic field, nonlinear interactions are slowed down by the transport of fluctuations (Alfvén effect). The usual Kolmogorov’s phenomenology must then be modified in favor of the Iroshnikov-Kraichnan (IK). This yields to the fact that the energy transfer rates per unit mass for both pseudo-energies associated to alfvénic fluctuations must be of the same order, $\epsilon^+ \sim \epsilon^-$. More precisely, they must have the same scaling laws in the IK phenomenology [7]. Thus, an initial small unbalance between alfvénic fluctuations is maintained during the cascade, eventually leading to both a turbulent spectrum, and high correlations [1]. This framework is referred to in the literature as Alfvénic turbulence. The above arguments have been criticized [5,6] on the basis of the fact that, at variance with the conjecture in Ref. [1], both in closures equations [5] and in direct numerical simulations [6] the energy transfer rates are never the same. A different phenomenological argument has also been introduced [8]. In a strongly anisotropic medium as the solar wind, the energy cascade will eventually develop in the direction transverse to the background magnetic field. Using the hypothesis of a critical balance between the time of transport in the parallel direction and the eddy turnover time for turbulence in the transverse direction, a Kolmogorov’s spectrum, rather than a Kraichnan’s spectrum, is expected for transverse wavevectors.

In homogeneous and isotropic fluid turbulence, the energy cascade is evidenced by the observation of a well defined relation between the third-order longitudinal structure function and the energy dissipation transfer rate, namely the well known 4/5-Kolmogorov’s law [9]. A similar relation have been derived for MHD, following the Yaglom law for passive scalars, in the framework of homogeneous and isotropic turbulence [10]. This law has been recently observed in samples of ecliptic [12] and polar [11] solar wind, thus showing unambiguously that a turbulent cascade is active. These observations solve the apparent paradox rised in the DMV paper, confirming the presence of both strong correlations and turbulent cascade. However, the anisotropic nature of solar wind turbulence occasionally violates the conditions for the observation of the Yaglom law, namely of the cascade. In this letter we analyze the relevance of anisotropy conjecture in deriving the Yaglom’s scaling law for MHD turbulence.

The Yaglom law for anisotropic and isotropic MHD. – Consider the anisotropic MHD equations (1) written twice for Elsässer variable $Z_i^\pm(x_i)$ at the point x_i , and for $Z_i^\pm(x_i + r_i)$ at the independent point $x'_i = x_i + r_i$. By subtraction, we obtain an equation for the differences $\Delta Z_i^\pm = (Z_i^\pm)' - Z_i^\pm$ (here and in the following “primed” variables are intended as calculated on the point x'_i). Using the hypothesis of independence of points x'_i and x_i with respect to derivatives, namely $\partial_i(Z_j^\pm)' = \partial'_i Z_j^\pm = 0$ (where ∂'_i represents derivative with respect to x'_i), we get

$$\partial_t \Delta Z_i^\pm + Z_\alpha^\mp \partial'_\alpha \Delta Z_i^\pm = -(\partial'_i + \partial_i) \Delta P + (\partial_\alpha^{2'} + \partial_\alpha^2) [\lambda^\pm \Delta Z_i^+ + \lambda^\mp \Delta Z_i^-] \quad (2)$$

($\Delta P = \pi' - \pi$). By adding and subtracting the term $Z_\alpha^\mp \partial'_\alpha \Delta Z_i^\pm$ to (2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \Delta Z_i^\pm + \Delta Z_\alpha^\mp \partial'_\alpha \Delta Z_i^\pm + Z_\alpha^\mp (\partial'_\alpha + \partial_\alpha) \Delta Z_i^\pm = & -(\partial'_i + \partial_i) \Delta P + \\ & + (\partial_\alpha^{2'} + \partial_\alpha^2) [\lambda^\pm \Delta Z_i^+ + \lambda^\mp \Delta Z_i^-] \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

We are seeking for an equation for the second-order correlation tensor $\langle \Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm \rangle$ related

to pseudo-energies. In fact, in a more general approach one should look at a mixed tensor, namely $\langle \Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\mp \rangle$, taking into account not only both pseudo-energies but also cross-helicity $\langle Z_i^+ Z_j^- \rangle$ and $\langle Z_i^- Z_j^+ \rangle$. However, using the DIA closure by Kraichnan, it is possible to show that these elements are in general poorly correlated [13]. Since we are interested in the energy cascade, we limit ourself to the most interesting equation that describes correlations about Alfvénic fluctuations of the same sign. To obtain the equations for pseudo-energies we multiply equations (3) by $\Delta Z_j^\pm$, then by averaging we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \langle \Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm \rangle &+ \langle \Delta Z_\alpha^\mp \partial'_\alpha (\Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm) \rangle + \langle Z_\alpha^\mp (\partial'_\alpha + \partial_\alpha) (\Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm) \rangle = \\ &= - \langle \Delta Z_j^\pm (\partial'_i + \partial_i) \Delta P + \Delta Z_i^\pm (\partial'_j + \partial_j) \Delta P \rangle + \\ &+ \lambda^\pm \langle \Delta Z_j^\pm (\partial_\alpha^{2'} + \partial_\alpha^2) \Delta Z_i^\pm \rangle + \lambda^\pm \langle \Delta Z_i^\pm (\partial_\alpha^{2'} + \partial_\alpha^2) \Delta Z_j^\pm \rangle + \\ &+ \lambda^\mp \langle \Delta Z_j^\pm (\partial_\alpha^{2'} + \partial_\alpha^2) \Delta Z_i^\mp \rangle + \lambda^\mp \langle \Delta Z_i^\pm (\partial_\alpha^{2'} + \partial_\alpha^2) \Delta Z_j^\mp \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

If we consider local homogeneity we have

$$\partial'_\alpha \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial(x_\alpha + r_\alpha)} \simeq \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha}$$

$$\partial_\alpha \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial(x'_\alpha - r_\alpha)} \simeq -\frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha}$$

when applied to difference quantities, so that the nonlinear term, using incompressibility, becomes

$$\langle \Delta Z_\alpha^\mp \partial'_\alpha (\Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm) \rangle = \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} \langle \Delta Z_\alpha^\mp (\Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm) \rangle$$

Note that in eq. (1) kinematic viscosity are not assumed equal to magnetic diffusivity, and this generates a coupling between $Z_i^\pm$ and $Z_i^\mp$ not only in the nonlinear term but also in the dissipative term. We exclude these couplings by making here the usual simplifying assumption, that kinematic viscosity is equal to magnetic diffusivity, $\lambda^\pm = \lambda^\mp = \nu$. Then, by using the independence of derivatives with respect to both points and using the local homogeneity hypothesis, the dissipative term becomes

$$\nu \langle (\partial_\alpha^{2'} + \partial_\alpha^2) (\Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm) \rangle = 2\nu \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r_\alpha^2} \langle \Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm \rangle - \frac{4}{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} (\epsilon_{ij}^\pm r_\alpha)$$

where we defined the average dissipation tensor

$$\epsilon_{ij}^\pm = \nu \langle (\partial_\alpha Z_i^\pm) (\partial_\alpha Z_j^\pm) \rangle \quad (5)$$

Using these equations in (4), we finally obtain the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \langle \Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm \rangle &+ \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} \langle \Delta Z_\alpha^\mp (\Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm) \rangle = \\ &= -\Lambda_{ij} - \Pi_{ij} + 2\nu \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r_\alpha^2} \langle \Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm \rangle - \frac{4}{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} (\epsilon_{ij}^\pm r_\alpha) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The first and second term on the r.h.s. of the last equation represent respectively a tensor related to large-scale inhomogeneities $\Lambda_{ij} = \langle Z_\alpha^\mp (\partial'_\alpha + \partial_\alpha) (\Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm) \rangle$, and the tensor related to the pressure term $\Pi_{ij} = \langle \Delta Z_j^\pm (\partial'_i + \partial_i) \Delta P + \Delta Z_i^\pm (\partial'_j + \partial_j) \Delta P \rangle$. Equation (6) is an exact equation for anisotropic MHD equations that links the second-order complete tensor to the third-order mixed tensor through the average dissipation rate tensor.

Using incompressibility and independence of derivatives with respect to both points, the first term on the r.h.s. can be written as $\Lambda_{ij} = (\partial'_\alpha + \partial_\alpha) \langle Z_\alpha^\mp (\Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta Z_j^\pm) \rangle$ which vanishes for a globally homogeneous situation, because in this case $\partial_i \langle \rangle \equiv 0$. The pressure term is more complicated to be managed. Using independence of derivatives and local homogeneity we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Delta Z_i^\pm \partial_j \Delta P \rangle &= \langle \partial_j [\Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta P] - (\partial_j z_i^\pm) \Delta P \rangle = \\ &= -\langle \partial'_j [\Delta Z_i^\pm \Delta P] \rangle - \langle (\partial_j z_i^\pm) \Delta P \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

from which

$$\Pi_{ij} = \langle [\partial'_j (z_i^\pm)' - \partial_j z_i^\pm] \Delta P \rangle + \langle [\partial'_i (z_j^\pm)' - \partial_i z_j^\pm] \Delta P \rangle \quad (8)$$

Then the diagonal terms of the tensor containing the pressure vanish. In fact summing over indices eq. (8) yields $[\partial'_i (z_i^\pm)' - \partial_i z_i^\pm]$ which is zero for local homogeneity and incompressibility. This means that, assuming global homogeneity and incompressibility, the equation for the trace of tensor can be written as

$$\partial_t \langle |\Delta Z_i^\pm|^2 \rangle + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} \langle \Delta Z_\alpha^\mp |\Delta Z_i^\pm|^2 \rangle = 2\nu \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r_\alpha^2} \langle |\Delta Z_i^\pm|^2 \rangle - \frac{4}{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} (\epsilon_{ii}^\pm r_\alpha) \quad (9)$$

This expression is valid even in the anisotropic case, that is fields depends on the vector r_α . Moreover by considering only the trace, we ruled out the possibility to investigate anisotropies related to different orientations of vectors within the second-order moment. It is worthwhile to remark here that *only* the diagonal elements of the dissipation rate tensor, namely $\epsilon_{ii}^\pm$ are positive defined, while in general the off-diagonal elements $\epsilon_{ij}^\pm$ can be in principle also negative. For a stationary state the equation (9) can be written as the divergenceless condition of a quantity involving the third-order correlations and the dissipation rates

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} \left[\langle \Delta Z_\alpha^\mp |\Delta Z_i^\pm|^2 \rangle - 2\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} \langle |\Delta Z_i^\pm|^2 \rangle - \frac{4}{3} (\epsilon_{ii}^\pm r_\alpha) \right] = 0 \quad (10)$$

from which we can obtain the Yaglom's relation by projecting equation (10) along the longitudinal $r_\alpha = r \mathbf{e}_r$ direction. This operation involves the assumption that the flow is locally isotropic, that is fields depends locally only on the separation r , so that

$$\left(\frac{2}{r} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) \left[\langle \Delta Z_r^\mp |\Delta Z_i^\pm|^2 \rangle - 2\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \langle |\Delta Z_i^\pm|^2 \rangle + \frac{4}{3} \epsilon_{ii}^\pm r \right] = 0 \quad (11)$$

The only solution that is compatible with the absence of singularity in the limit $r \rightarrow 0$ is

$$\langle \Delta Z_r^\mp |\Delta Z_i^\pm|^2 \rangle = 2\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \langle |\Delta Z_i^\pm|^2 \rangle - \frac{4}{3} \epsilon_{ii}^\pm r \quad (12)$$

which reduces to the Yaglom's law for MHD turbulence as obtained by Politano and Pouquet [10] in the inertial range when $\nu \rightarrow 0$

$$\langle \Delta Z_r^\mp |\Delta Z_i^\pm|^2 \rangle = -\frac{4}{3} \epsilon_{ii}^\pm r \quad (13)$$

Finally, in the fluid-like case where $z_i^+ = z_i^- = v_i$ we obtain the usual Yaglom's law $\langle \Delta v_r |\Delta v_i|^2 \rangle = -4/3 (\epsilon r)$ (ϵ being the usual dissipation rate) which immediately reduces to the Kolmogorov's law $\langle \Delta v_r^3 \rangle = -4/5 (\epsilon r)$ in the isotropic case where $\langle \Delta v_r \Delta v_y^2 \rangle = \langle \Delta v_r \Delta v_z^2 \rangle = 1/3 \langle \Delta v_r^3 \rangle$ (assuming the separation r along the streamwise direction x).

Even if eq. (13) remains formally valid only for isotropic MHD, this cannot completely solve the problem of the energy cascade in MHD. The tensor Π_{ij} is zero only when local anisotropy is assumed. In fact by calculating the divergence with respect to the index i of Π_{ij} , assuming independence of derivatives, we get

$$\partial_i \langle \Delta Z_i^\pm (\partial_j P - \partial_j' P') \rangle = \langle \Delta Z_i^\pm \partial_i \partial_j P \rangle = \partial_i \langle \Delta Z_i^\pm \partial_j P \rangle = -\langle \partial_i' \Delta Z_i^\pm \partial_j P \rangle = 0 \quad (14)$$

By symmetry the divergence with respect to j also vanishes, that is $\partial_j^2 \Pi_{ij} = 0$. By using for Π_{ij} the isotropic formula for a generic tensor [18]

$$\Pi_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) = [\Pi_{11}(r) - \Pi_{\alpha\alpha}(r)] \frac{r_i r_j}{r^3} + \Pi_{\alpha\alpha}(r) \delta_{ij}$$

it can be easily shown that $\Pi_{ij} = 0$ by local isotropy [18].

Reduced MHD. – As a different approach, let us consider the Reduced MHD approximation (RMHD) [19, 20] which is valid under the hypothesis of a strong guide magnetic field. In this approximation, the dynamics along the parallel and perpendicular directions (with respect to the average magnetic field) are disentangled. Then we can distinguish between derivatives for perpendicular ($\partial/\partial x_\perp$) and parallel ($\partial/\partial x_\parallel$) coordinates. In terms of Elsässer variables, the RMHD approximation reads [21]

$$\frac{\partial Z_\perp^\pm}{\partial t} + Z_\perp^\mp \frac{\partial Z_\perp^\pm}{\partial x_\perp} \pm \frac{\partial Z_\perp^\pm}{\partial x_\parallel} = -\frac{\partial \pi}{\partial x_\perp} + \lambda^\pm \frac{\partial^2 Z_\perp^\pm}{\partial x_\perp^2} + \lambda^\mp \frac{\partial^2 Z_\perp^\mp}{\partial x_\perp^2} \quad (15)$$

where $Z_\perp^\pm(x_\parallel, x_\perp)$ is the perpendicular component of the Elsässer variables. From this equations, by performing the same calculations as before, and by defining the separations along the perpendicular $r_\perp$ and parallel $r_\parallel$ directions respectively, we obtain the following Kármán-Howarth relation for the stationary state

$$\langle \Delta Z_\perp^\mp |\Delta Z_\perp^\pm|^2 \rangle = 2\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\perp} \langle |\Delta Z_\perp^\pm|^2 \rangle - 2\epsilon_{ii}^\pm r_\perp + \frac{2}{r_\perp} \int_0^{r_\perp} r'_\perp \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\parallel} \langle |\Delta Z_\perp^\pm|^2 \rangle dr'_\perp \quad (16)$$

From this last equation it is evident that, in the limit of vanishing viscosity $\nu \rightarrow 0$, in general a Yaglom's relation cannot be derived. This can only be the case by assuming that the average pseudo-energies are almost constant along the parallel direction. So, if the third term on the r.h.s. is zero, we can derive a Yaglom's relation between the mixed third-order correlation term as a linear function of the transverse scale $r_\perp$

$$\langle \Delta Z_\perp^\mp |\Delta Z_i^\pm|^2 \rangle \sim -2\epsilon_{ii}^\pm r_\perp \quad (17)$$

Even if this is only an approximate relation, it is worthwhile to note that, in this last case, by assuming the scaling $\Delta Z_\perp^\mp \sim \Delta Z_\perp^\pm$, relation (17) is compatible with the scaling law $\Delta Z_\perp^\pm \sim r_\perp^{2/3}$, which immediately leads to the Kolmogorov spectrum $E(k_\perp) \sim k_\perp^{5/3}$ predicted for anisotropic MHD turbulence [8].

Conclusions. – To conclude, we reviewed the derivation of a general Yaglom’s equation for MHD turbulence where two fields are coupled. When this equation is satisfied a turbulent cascade is at work. The most general equation (6) that relates the third-order mixed tensor to the dissipation rate tensor, is valid in the anisotropic and nonhomogeneous case. By using homogeneity, we derive the equation (10), that is valid in presence of anisotropy, while to derive the usual Yaglom’s law (13) the local isotropy assumption is required. Moreover, the tensor containing the pressure has zero diagonal elements, but is completely zero only when local isotropy is assumed. As far as the local isotropy assumption is considered, while for usual fluid flows the return to isotropy at small-scales is assured, even if they are anisotropic at large-scale [14], in general th MHD flows cannot return completely to isotropy at small scales [15–17]. This in turn means that if we want to fully investigate the turbulent cascades in anisotropic MHD flows, the off-diagonal elements of the third-order mixed tensor cannot be disregarded. Of course the tensor term related to pressure cannot be eliminated, while if we cannot assume local isotropy the relation (10) cannot reduces to the usual Yaglom’s law obtained in Ref.s [10] and investigated experimentally in Ref.s [11, 12]. Of course, since the tensor term Π_{ij} cannot be calculated using solar wind data, we cannot have any feeling of the relative importance of this term and the term containing the dissipation rate tensor in anisotropic MHD turbulence. High-resolution numerical simulations for anisotropic MHD turbulence should be used as a first approach.

* * *

We acknowledge useful discussions with W.H. Matthaeus.

REFERENCES

- [1] DOBROWOLNY M., MANGENEY A. and VELTRI P., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **45** (1980) 144.
- [2] COLEMAN P.J., *Astrophys. J.*, **153** (1968) 371.
- [3] BELCHER and DAVIS, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **76** (1971) 3534.
- [4] BRUNO R. and CARBONE V., *Living Rev. Sol. Phys.*, **2** (2005) 4
- [5] GRAPPIN R., POUQUET A. and LEORAT J., *Astron. Astrophys.*, **126** (1983) 51
- [6] MATTHAEUS W.H., GOLDSTEIN M.L. and MONTGOMERY D.C., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **51** (1982) 1484
- [7] CARBONE V., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **71** (1993) 1546
- [8] GOLDREIK P. and SRIDHAR S., *Astrophys. J.*, **438** (1995) 763
- [9] FRISCH U., *Turbulence: The legacy of A.N. Kolmogorov* (Cambridge Univ. Press) 1995
- [10] POLITANO H., and POUQUET A., *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **25** (1998) 273
- [11] SORRISO-VALVO L., MARINO R., CARBONE V., NOULLEZ A., LEPRETI F., VELTRI P., BUNO R., BAVASSANO B. and PIETROPAOLO E., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **99** (2007) 115001
- [12] MCBRIDE B.T., SMITH C.W. and FORMAN M.A., *Astrophys. J.*, **679** (2008) 1644
- [13] VELTRI P., *Nuovo Cimento*, **3C** (1980) 45
- [14] BIFERALE L. and PROCACCIA I., *Phys. Rep.*, **414** (2005) 43
- [15] CARBONE V., and VELTRI P., *Geophys. Astrophys. Fluid Dyn.*, **52** (1990) 153
- [16] SORRISO-VALVO L., CARBONE V., BRUNO R. and VELTRI P., *Europhys. Lett.*, **75** (2006) 832
- [17] BIGAZZI A., BIFERALE L., GAMA S.M.A. and VELLI M., *Astrophys. J.*, **638** (2006) 499
- [18] MONIN A.S., and YAGLOM A.M., *Statistical Fluid MEchanics: Mechanics of Turbulence, Vol 2* (MIT Press) 1975
- [19] MONTGOMERY D.C. and TURNER L., *Phys. Fluids*, **24** (1981) 825
- [20] ZANK G.P. and MATTHAEUS W.H., *J. Plasma Phys.*, **48** (1992) 85
- [21] NIGRO G., MALARA F., CARBONE V. and VELTRI P., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **92** (2004) 194501